

03a

873. c.15

X England, Church



T. Jolley Esq. F.S.A.

03a

873. c.15

X England, Church



T. Jolley Esq. F.S.A.

THE
RE-EXAMINATION
of two of the articles
abridged:

TO WIT,

*Of the communicants gesture in
the act of receaving, eating, and
drinking:*

And

The observation of Festivall dayes.
43-4-6-686.



TO
Printed anno 1636.



TO THE READER.

WEE have here, good Reader, the re-examination of two articles abridged, to wit, concerning the Communicants gesture in the act of receaving, and observation of festivall dayes, for the information of such, as either have not leasure to peruse greater workes, or are of weaker iudgement. The other three articles, bishopping, private baptisme, and private Communion are not pressed, and therefore it was needlesse to proceed any further. Accept of this information without preiudice of your standing to the liberties of the Kirk. Wee need no other exception against all the five articles, but that they were not concluded by pluralitie of voices of such as were authorized with lawfull commission, and consequently not by a generall assemblie: But a number of Barons, pretended bishops, and ministers usurped the place of voters, and carried the businesse. I passe by terrours, circumveening, and unformall proceeding, howsoever others take libertie to practise and reason contrare to the order established in former times, as if wee had never had a kirk, yet let this be your iudiciall defence. But because that alone is not sufficient to uphold your conscience, yee have here as much as may serve to confirme you in the trueth, and to settle your iudgement in the matter it self.

OF

OF THE COMMUNICANTS gesture in the act of receaving.



Y the second head of the first book of discipline, drawn up in the first year of publick and universal reformation, wee may perceive that our first reformers preferred sitting not only to

kneeling, but also to standing and passing by, because they approached not so near to Christs action, and rested upon sitting, not only because of the abuse of kneeling in former times, as is alleadged, but because molt agreeable to the patern, which reason serveth for all times: Yea Master Knox in his admonition to England, printed *anno* 1554. ranketh kneeling among the superstitious orders, which profane Christs true religion: and in a letter directed from Deep to Mاستر Anna Lock, *anno* 1599. he calleth the crosse in Baptisme: and this kneeling diabolical inventions. In the generall assemblie, holden *anno* 1562. it was ordained, that the order at Geneva, that is, of the English Kirk at Geneva, where Master Knox had been sometime Minister, bee observed in the ministration of the Sacraments: And *anno* 1564.

Ministers are referred to the order set down before the Psalmes in Meeter, which order is the order of Geneva, mentioned in the former act. This order was ratified by act of Parliament, *anno* 1567. and 1572. An act was likewise made *anno* 1567. that in times coming the King at his coronation give his oath to maintain the true religion then professed, and in speciall the due & right ministration of the Sacraments then received. This act was ratified *anno* 1581. and again 1592. No other gesture then sitting was used till the meeting above mentioned. Wee are then to defend the gesture of sitting, and to impugn kneeling in the act of receaving.

Wee have the example of Christ and his Apostles at the first supper, to warrant communicants to sit in the act of receaving: After the ordinarie washing of their hands they sate down to the first course of the paschall supper, thereafter they rose again to the washing of their feet, then they sate down again to the second course of the paschall supper. Now while they were eating and consequently while they were sitting, Christ institute the Sacrament of the supper, and this is acknowledged by Baronius the Cardinall, in his annalls, *an.* 34. *num.* 44. The Iesuit Baradas, in *concord. Evangelist. tom.* 4. *lib.* 2. Ancient and modern writers, popish and Protestant have received this collection as certain truth. It was the minde

minde of the whole church of old, as we may see by the Ecclesiasticall hymnes, where Christ is brought in sitting with his disciples at table, when he institute the Sacrament.

Whereas some alleadge that Christ and the Apostles kneeled: I answer, there is no likelihood at all: Christ sate when he brake bread, and gave thanks at Emaus. He blessed the bread when hee sate with the multitude which hee fed with five loaves and two fishes. Wee never reade that the Iewes kneeled when they blessed their meat. Master Paybodie granteth, that Christ and his Apostles used that same gesture in blessing and giving thanks, which they did in receaving. Bellarmine acknowledgeth that they were sitting at table, when Christ said unto them, *Drink yee all of this*. We may gather from some circumstances and the forme of the celebration, that they sate for they could not stand upon beds, or between the tables and the beds, for their neerenesse to the table. If there had beene a change from sitting, which was the ordinarie gesture at the paschall supper, into kneeling a gesture of adoration at the Evangelicall supper, some of the Evangelists would have made mention of it, for they make mention of other changes. If there had beene such a change, then kneeling should have beene institute, which none of our opposits have ever maintained: for to what end should the change have

have beene made, if not that that gesture might be observed afterward. Christ spake not prayer waies to the apostles, and the elements were carried from hand to hand, and divided by the Apostles among themselves, which is not compatible with kneeling, when man is directing worship to God. Wee conclude then with Master Mouline, writing on the Lords supper, 1 part. pag. 136. that *the apostles continued sitting at the table, to the very end of the action.* It is true, Christ and his apostles sitting were not altogether upright as ours, but as a man may stand upright, or stand leaning, so he may sit upright, or sit leaning. The Hebrew doctors call it sitting in beds: the English translators expresse it by sitting, and not by lying. Doctour Mortoun confesseth it was a kinde of sitting gesture. Master Paybodie, pag. 69. protesteth, that he holdeth the gesture of sitting at the Lords table in it self lawfull and commendable. What a madnesse is it then to drive poore soules from a sure, to a dangerous and doubtfull way?

The example of Christ and his disciples sitting at the first supper, is exemplarie for examples in setting down a patern, serve ordinarily for direction in times to come, if there be not some singular occasion to hinder him that setteth down the pattern to do otherwise. Bishop Mortoun in his late work of the institution of the Sacrament, sayeth

sayeth, that Christs example should bee a rule for us to observe, except in some circumstances, which only occasionally and accidentally happened therein; and therefore taxeth the Iesuits, making light of Christs example, as if the example of Christ were no argument of proof at all. Mowline in his heavenly alarum, pag 56. sayeth, Christ and his apostles sate at the table without any kind of adoration, and that the first institution was given for a patern; whereunto wee ought to conform. Now the washing of the disciples feet, the putting off, and on of Christs upper garment were ended before they sate down to the second course of the paschall supper, and consequently a good space before the institution of the last supper. Time and place are commoun circumstances to all actions. The particular time and place when Christ instituted this Sacrament were occasionall. They might not eat the paschall supper but at evening, and therefore the Evangelical supper, which was to succeed to it, behoved to bee celebrate that night, seeing Christs suffering was so neer at hand. They behoved to eat the paschall lamb in a chamber in Ierusalem, and consequently the supper behooved to bee instituted in a chamber, after the paschall supper. The number of such as did eat the paschall lamb, behooved to consist of few, betwixt ten and twentie, and therefore

therefore they behooved to bee so few that night at the institution of the supper. Their manner and kinde of sitting was a form observed among the Iewes at their commoun feasts, and at the paschall supper. Put the case that they stood at the first Passeover in Egypt, as it can not bee proved, it were then extraordinarie, and for that night only, to signifie their hastie departure out of Egypt. Sitting was the ordinarie gesture used at all religious feasts: The Heathnicks sate at their feasts, made of the remainder of the sacrifices offered to their idoles, *Amos 2. 1 Cor. 8. 10* to professe their communion and societie with their idoll, or fellowship with devils, as the Apostle calleth it, *1 Cor. 10. 20*. Our Lord instituting his supper to bee the only religious feast to bee used in the Christian kirk, observed the same gesture which was used at the paschall supper, and other religious feasts. Christ might easily have changed sitting into kneeling, and very commodiouse, seeing they sate upon beds, yet would he retain the same gesture which they used at the paschall supper. Time and place are meere circumstances, and the particular time and place were then only occasionall: But the gesture is more then a meere circumstance, as Master Paybodie, *pag. 34*. confesseth. This supper was institute in form of a banquet, to represent not only our spirituall nuture, but also our societie, and

and familiaritie with Christ, who is to sup & feast with us. The Polonian Baroun Ioannes Alasco maintaineth further, that our sitting, eating, and drinking at the ~~commune~~ table, is a figure and representation of our sitting at the heavenly table. So doth Musculus upon *Matthew* 26: and Aquinas *part. 3. quest. 60.* make the Lords supper a type and fore-shewing sign of our glory to come. Christ himself expresseth our peaceable fruition of the joyes of heaven by sitting with Abraham, Isaac, and Iaakob in the kingdome of Heaven, *Matth. 8. 11.* and by Lazarus resting in Abrahams bosome, *Luke 16.* that is, sitting at the heavenly table, and leaning upon Abrahams bosome, after the same manner that Iohn lay on Christs bosome when hee sate at this table, *Iohn 16.* and Christ himself at the institution promised to his Apostles, that they should eat and drink at his table in his kingdome, and sit upon twelve thrones, *Luke 22. 30.* Yea, this Polonian Baroun affirmeth, that they have slender affection to the glory of Christ, or ~~our~~ eternall felicitie, that would abolish out of the kirk that image of our eternall felicitie in the celestiall glory to come, which is so much recommended to us by Christ himselfe, by the symbole of sitting at a banquet, to the unspeakable comfort of all the faithfull. We see that at civill banquets, the time, the place, the number of persons, and other things are variable, but no other

other gesture hath beene used but sitting, after one form or other, according to the custome of the nation. Even when men are invited by a king to a feast, they are honoured with sitting, in token of his familiar intertainment.

It appeareth by the practise of the Apostolicall kirks, observing still this gesture, albeit other circumstances of time and place, and other things which fell forth occasionally at the first supper were not regarded, that the gesture of sitting is still to be retained. Christ himself, *Luke 24, 30.* sitting at table in Emaus, tooke bread, blessed it, and brake it. This place is interpreted by sundrie ancients and modern writers of the ministration of the Sacrament: And Master Paybodie himself, pag. 86. is of that same judgement. The apostle, *1 Cor. 11.* maketh not mention of sitting, because he presupposed a lawfull Minister, a table, and sitting at the table, and rehearseth only Christs actions and his words, uttered to communicants sitting at the table. Nor yet all his actions, and his words, as giving of the bread, blessing of the cup, either severally or conjunctly with the bread, and the precept to drink all of it: His chief purpose was to correct the abuse of the Corinthiās, for not staying upon other: for the Lord that *night hee was betrayed, said to all his disciples conveened together, Take yee, eat, yee, &c.* The love-feasts and the Lords supper went together, the love-feasts in these times preceeding, and the Lords supper immediably following. Doctor Bilson in his book

after
me of
a king
token
ollicall
r cir-
hings
upper
ng is
o. sit-
ed it,
ndrie
tion
hself,
tle, I
e he
ting
ions
ting
his
the
ead,
our-
ās,
hat
ned
and
asts
per
book

of obedience, pag. 653. sayeth, that whether they went before or after, they could not divide themselves each from other, but they must offer the same abuse, and disdain of the poor at the Lords supper, which was ministred to them as they sate at their tables, immediatly before or after their usuall or corporall refreshings. Master Paybodie pag, 86, and 91. thinketh, that together with the institution it self, after supper were grounded the love-feasts, by continued occasion, whereof his disciples might possibly for a time use sitting in the very act of receaving. Doctor Downam in his second sermon, pag. 61. confesseth sitting to receive the Sacrament, to have been used in the kirk in the apostles times.

Sitting in the act of receaving was continued at sometimes in the Christian kirk, evē to our times. Mornæus in his first book of the masse, 1 cap. and 5 reporteth, that the Monks of St. Bennets order communicate sitting, for three dayes before Easter. Bullinger in his book *de origine errorum*, pag. 46 reporteth, *that not only in their monastries, but also in cathedrall kirks they communicate sitting upon that day.*

Now it was the custome of old, not only for the Monks, but also other Christians to communicate upon this day, and no doubt after the same form. The two thousand souldiours who were reconciled to the Emperour Mauritius, about the year 1590. by the travell of Gregorius bishop of Antioch, received the Sacrament sitting upon the ground, as Euagrius reporteth, *lib. 6. cap 13.*

Doctor Lindefay in his defence, *pag.* 53, 54. alleadgeth the like done by the Scottish armie at Bonnokburn, in the dayes of King Robert Bruce. Socrates in his historie, *lib.* 5. *cap.* 23. reporteth of the Egyptians, who dwelt near to Alexandria, and the inhabitants of Thebais, ^{that they} communicated in the evening, after they had refreshed themselves with commoun meats upon other dayes also: it is likely then they also sate. Alexander de Hales in the second part of his tractat. concerning the masse, sayeth, the Pope communicateth sitting, in remembrance that the Apostles at the Lords supper communicated sitting. The Waldenses, who are justly called the ~~pure~~ seed of the ancient kirk, and have continued since the dayes of Pope Sylvester, or as some thought, from the dayes of the Apostles, sayeth Rainerius the inquisitor, & their enemy, celebrated the communion sitting, See Master Fox first volumn, *pag.* 209 *edit.* 1610. and their apologie against one Doctor Augustine; which is extant in Lydii Waldensia. Luther exponing the epistle upon Saint Stevins day; sayeth, Christ so instituted the Sacrament, that in it we should sit at the Sacrament: but all things are changed, and idle ordinances of men are come in place of divine ordinances.

Zuinglius in *expositione fidei Christianae*, setting down the form of celebration used at Berne, Zurich, Basile, and other neighbour townes, reporteth

teth, that they communicated sitting. The kirks of strangers at London, in Alascoes time communicated sitting: so do other kirks in the Low-countries, even to this day. In Pol, such as adhered to the confession of Helvetia communicated sitting, as we may see in *consensus Poloniae*.

By the gesture of standing is pretended more reverence, and thereby the gesture of sitting is indirectly taxed, and that lively representation of our familiar societie with Christ taken away, seeing it is not the usuall and ordinarie gesture at civill feasts.

As for kneeling in the act of receaving: First wee have not a warrant from the example of Christ and his Apostles, or the practises of the Apostolick kirks after, and therefore they who receive ^{without} adoration, they are secure, they have the example of the Apostles, whom wee read not to have adored prostrate, but as they were sitting, they received, and did eat: They have the practise of the Apostolicall kirks, where it is declared, that the faithfull did communicate, not in adoration, but in breaking of bread, sayeth Calvin, *Institut. lib. 4. cap. 37. sect. 33.* Beza in his dispute against Iodocus Harchius, So like, as when the Lord cruelly to bee adored as God and man, at table did institute this holy supper, that the Disciples arose, to the end that falling upon their knees, they might receive that bread and wine out of his hand. And so like as the Apostles were ignorant, how to deliver to the kirks the man-
ner

ner how to celebrate these holy mysteries, it is known well enough that the love-feasts could hardly or scarce at all admit geniculation. The Waldenses in the apologie above-mentioned, say, that Christ gave the Sacrament to his Disciples, and his successours for a long time made no reverence, meaning adoration.

This holy action is denominate the LORDS table, and the Lords Supper: The use of a table is not only to set meat on it; but also for the guests, or persons invited to sit at, and about it, and to partake of the meat set upon the table.

Wee require not of necessitie an artificiall table of tymber: a Bul-hyde, or a plot of ground may serve in time of necessitie, and answereth analogically to a standing table, as the plot of ground did, whereabout the multitude sate in rowes, by fifties and fifties, *Mark. 6.* Neither do wee stand upon the fashion, whether it bee long or round; but wee require that the Communicants alwayes sit table-wayes, so that they may observe the form of a feast or banquet: For in that this holy action is called a supper, it is imported, that it was celebrate in the forme of a feast or banquet, as Piscator observeth in his observations upon *Matth. 26.* Wee do not require all the formes used at commoun feasts, but these which Christ the institutour, and Master of the feast thought sufficient.

Kneeling is not a gesture futable with the forme of a banquet, or use of a supper table.

The

The termes, *Supper*, and *table of the Lord*, very familiar with the *Apostle Paul*, seeme to require sitting rather then standing, kneeling, or passing by, sayeth *Alasco*. Kneeling is not a gesture which hath beene used at feasts or banquets, but rather a gesture of supplicants. *Plessie* in his fourth book of *Eucharist*. sayeth, *that of old this holy Supper was celebrated in the forme of a banquet, whereat they did sit, a footstep whereof remaineth among the Benedictines*. If these termes, *the Table of the LORD, the Supper of the LORD, and breaking of bread* had beene retained, and other new names not invented, as *Sacrament Eucharist*, then might easilie have been perceaved how harsh it were to use these phrases, *They brake bread together kneeling, they compassed the table of the LORD kneeling, they celebrate the Supper of the LORD kneeling*, which seemeth not so harsh, when wee say, *they receaved the Sacrament or Eucharist kneeling*. Therefore the *ancient Doctors*, sayeth *Mowline* on the *LORDS Supper*, part. 1. pag. 8. *had done better, if they had hold themselves to the tearmes expressed in Gods word, &c.*

The distribution of the elements by the communicants amongst themselves admitteth not kneeling in the act of receaving. Can the communicant bee both adoring GOD upon his knees, and at the verie instant bee reaching the elements to his brother likewise kneeling

ling and adorning. Yee have heard out of Calvin before, that the faithfull in the Apostolicall times did not communicate with adoration, but breaking of bread, as if adoration and breaking of bread could not consist together: But so it is that the Communicants ought to distribute, and reach the elements to other. Christ reaching the cup to his Disciples, commandeth them to divide it among themselves, *Luke 22. 17.* This cup which hee commanded them to divide, was the Evangelicall cup, or, which is all one, the last paschall cup changed into the Evangelicall. *Luke* applieth Christs protestation, that he will drink no more of the fruit of the wine, &c. to the cup which hee commanded them to divide among themselves: but that protestation is applied to the common cup by *Matth.* and *Mark.* who make mention only of this cup, in the verses immediately preceeding the protestation. If Christ was to drink incontinent after this protestation of the common cup, how could hee protest, that hee would drink no more of the fruit of the wine? When the Schoolemen would prove, that wine was one of the elements at the Evangelicall supper, they can not finde a proof in all the Evangelists, but in this protestation. Christ in this protestation alludeth to the canon or custome of the Jewes, forbidding to taste any thing after the last cup, which was called the cup of praise. Now

the last cup was the Evangelicall or communion cup, or the last paschall cup, changed it into the Evangelicall. Further Christ gave thanks when he took the cup in his hand, which he comanded them to divide: and therefore Luke maketh no mention of this thanksgiving, when hee maketh mention of the cup the second time, because hee had made mention of it before. Luke then by way of anticipation bringeth in Christ, protesting in the 17. verse, that the protestation of not drinking more, may bee joined with the protestation of not eating more, preceeding in the 16. verse: therefore when hee cometh to the order of the institution, verse 20. he omitteth the protestation and thanksgiving, which are recorded by other Evangelists, because hee made mention before of them, verse 17. and 18. This anticipation, or inversion of order, in the Evangelist Luke was observed by Augustine, and Euthymius, Baradius, and Suarez, Iesuits. Mewshius observeth other inversions in the same chapter. Christ gave not the cuppe to every one out of his hand, which had been sufficient for dividing of it, if no further had beene intended. To drinke of one cuppe representeth fellowship in one common benefite, but not that communication of mutuall love and amitie which is represented by reaching the same cup to other *The guests at ci-*
will banquets of old, intertaining other courteously,

reached a cup of wine to other, which cup they called
 philoreia, metonymically, because it was a symbol of
 love or friendship, which name any man may justly im-
 pose upon the cup of the holy supper of the Lord, sayeth
 Seuckius *antiquitatum convivialium*, lib. 3. cap. 10.
 If there were no more but reaching the cup from
 one to another, it were sufficient to exclude knee-
 ling: for what reason were it to kneel at the re-
 ceaving of the bread, and not at the receaving of
 the cup? Were it not also absurd to see the com-
 municants reaching the cup to other, and the Mi-
 nister to walk along to give every one the bread?
 Analogie requireth that the bread should bee di-
 stributed among the communicants as well as the
 wine. Christ said in the plural number, *Take yee,
 eat yee, as well as drink yee, divide yoe, and not take
 thou, eat thou*: therefore not only Biscator, Fessa-
 nus, and Hospinian, but also Estius a popish wri-
 ter, upon the 1 Cor. 10. 16. gather, that they di-
 vide the bread as well as the cup. Beza sayeth,
 that the manner of their sitting could not permit
 Christ to give every one the bread. Mouline on
 the Lords supper, 2 part. pag. 97. maintaineth, that
 Christ could not deliver the bread to every one
 of the disciples hands, especially considering that
 the parties lying half along upon beds at the ta-
 ble, tooke up more rowme then they do now a
 dayes. This distribution of the bread, as well as
 of the cup is confirmed by the custome observed
 afterward. Master Paybodie, pag. 92. 101, 104.
 acknow-

acknowledgeth, that the Communicants at the first supper did communicate the bread and cup one with another: as also in the Apostles time, pag. 95. Bullinger in the place above cited, reporteth, that in the Monastries of S. Bennets order, & cathedrall kirks they communicated upon Maunday-thursday, *panem azymum frangentes, & calicem invicem propinantes, & in eorum vobis cena vestigium preferentes*; that is, *breaking unleavened bread, and reaching the cup to other*. This was a footstep of the order observed universally before upon the anniversary day, called the day of the Lords supper, which is now called Maunday-thursday. Frier Rainerius reporteth, that the Waldenses participate mutually, as was done at Christs supper. Bullinger in his 6. deead, sermon 9. *that the supper of the Lord is then rightly celebrated, when the communicants distribute the bread and the cup among themselves*. Gualter homil. 118. in Marcum, setting down the best form of celebration, requireth, that they break the bread to other, and distribute the cup. Tindall in his tractat upon the Lords supper, requireth, that every man reach, and break to his neighbour. The latter confession of Helvetia, which is approved by many reformed kirks, and by our owne, recommendeth this breaking of bread. The Lords supper was denominate breaking of bread, from that rite or ceremonie of the breaking of the bread, Acts. 2. it is said, the disciples continued in breaking of bread, and Acts.

2d. that the disciples conueened to break bread, which is clearer then the former speech, and importeth, that the disciples, or the faithfull themselves brake bread. Estius, a popish professor in Doway, writing upon 1 Cor. 10. 16. sayeth, that in the primitive kirk they had the breaking of bread, which was first done by the Presbyteries and deacons, and after them in smaller pieces, by the faithfull to whom it was given, that they might distribute the same among themselves. The Apostle 1 Cor. 10. 16. sayeth, *The bread which we break, is not the communion of the body of Christ? that is, the bread we break, distribute, and eat.* For the breaking alone by the Minister is not the communion of the body of Christ. The Apostle rehearsing the words of the institution, sayeth not, *Take thou, eat thou*, but in the plurall number, *take yee, eat yee*: Yea, Durandus *Rational. lib. 4. cap. 1.* sayeth, that the apostles celebrated as Christ did.

The breaking of the bread serveth for two uses: first, for the representation of Christs sufferings; as also the pouring of the wine represented mystically the effusion of his blood. Bullinger sayeth, *decad. 5. serm. 7. Wee break the bread of the Lord with our own hands, for we our selves are to bee blamed, that hee was bruised: our sins wounded him; wee crucified him, and wee believe, that not only hee suffered for others, but specially for our selves.* Gualtor in his homil. 295. on Matthew, sayeth, *That every one when they break the bread, acknowledgeth themselves to be the authors of his death and passion.* The other

of
th
sh
to
gr
br
be
ent
of
use
ca
in
tha
pat
bef
foo
I
the
Chr
son
Apo
pre
Past
stian
Mun
Thi
ed
acti
pag.
ano

other use is for distribution, and reaching to other, to testifie mutuall love and amittie. If two should drink out of one cup, and yet not reach to other, it might well be thought there were no great kindnesse betweene them. To divide the bread, and to eat together, in token of love and benevolence, was a custome observed in the orientall countries, and yet still in sundrie countries of the West. *Serrarius in Iesum, cap. 9.* Of this use the reader may finde more in *Bullinger, Decad. 5.* and *Gualter 118.* in *Marcum.* *Zuinglius* in his exposition of the Christian faith, reporteth that some sitting together casuallie, and participating after this manner, were reconcealed, who before had beene at variance, and that this fell foorth often.

If none must give the sacramentall bread but the Minister, because hee acteth the person of Christ who gave his own bodie, by the same reason they may not reach the cup to other, as the Apostles did at the first supper, where they represented the faithfull, and communicated not as Pastours, but as disciples, as guests, as other Christians, as all our divines hold: and among the rest, *Museulus* cited by *Doctour Lindsey, pag. 59.* This Doctour confesseth the cup may bee reached from one to another, the Minister still acting CHRIST'S person in his own place, *pag. 61. 62.*

If none but the Minister must give the elements, because hee representeth Christs person, then might not the Deacon in the ancient kirk do it, because hee represented not Christs person. Vaquez confesseth, that it is not forbidden by divine law, that the Sacrament bee ministred, or carried by a lay man, and applied to the hand of another Communicant, but by humane law. I would ask when the Minister cometh from his own place, and goeth along to deliver the elements, how doeth hee act the person of Christ, the Master of the feast? There can bee no other reason of this guise, but to nourish a superstitious conceit, that it is holier to receave it out of the hand of the Minister, who perhaps is a Judas, then out of the hand of a faithfull brother, as if his hand profained or polluted it. Are not the peoples hands as holy as the Ministers, sayeth Master Paybodie, pag. 313. Superstition increasing at last, the communicants might not take the Sacrament in their own hand, to put it in their mouth, but it behoved the Priest to put it in their mouth: Such superstitious conceits condemne Christ and his Apostles, and the godly, who in their time distributed to other, and depriver^{was} of the profitable uses of fraction, or breaking of bread. Neither is the representation or form of a feast or banquet observed: it is rather like a dole of meat then a supper. Further, this giving of the elements to every one

ry one severally, bringeth in confusion of actions, and private communions in the publick assembly. For while the Ministers are giving the elements to every one, the people is in the meane time exercised in hearing the word read, or singing Psalms, and heare not what the Minister sayeth to the Communicants, nor do the Communicants understand what is read, or sung in publick. Yea, sometimes two Ministers will bee speaking at once to sundrie communicants: so the communicants communicate apart, and might as well go aside, or to an Ile of the kirk to communicate, yea, and far better. The exercise is dead and cold, and they are forced to reading and singing in the mean time, to drive away tediousnesse, and so bring in confusion of actions. If Christ spake in the plurall number, *Take yee, eat yee*, when the communicants were so few, what would he have done if there had beene a great multitude present? If the distribution of the communicants had beene observed by the ancients constantly, and at all times, as sometimes it was, kneeling had not entered in the kirk, the words uttered by Christ at the deliverie of the elements had not beene changed, confusion of actions, and a private forme of communicating had not taken place, and the forme of a feast had beene preserved. Therefore suppose the distributing by the communicants were not recommended to us, nor

had any other profitable use, but that it is a bar to hold out so many corruptions, let us stand for distribution. Our Lord was wise, and could devise the best form: *Who can devise a better,* sayeth Bullinger, *de ad. 5. serm. 9. then the Son of God himself? the supreme high Priest of his kirk:* Yea Bellarmine sayeth, *de Eucharist. lib. 4. cap. 7. that it can not bee doubted, but that is better, & to be done which Christ did.*

Kneeling in the act of receaving the sacramentall elements is scandalous, and therefore to bee avoided. The papist is confirmed in his vile idolatrie, by our conforming with him in that gesture. Do they not vaunt, that wee are coming home to them? The Ministers of Edinburgh in the instructions given to Master William Levingston, subscribed also by them, when he was sent up to Court, have these words, *The Papists seeing us in that gesture having some externall symbolizing with them, are therby confirmed in their errour, as though that our practise were an approaching to them, and an ingresse to their idolatrie and bread-worship.* Now we ought not to keep conformitie in the worship of God with idolaters in things otherwise lawfull, if they bee not of necessarie use, and have beene abused. The Lord took this course with his own people of old, hee forbade them to round the corners of their heads, or marre the corners of their beard, or weare linsey-woolsey, or sow their field with mingled seed, or plant any groaves of trees neare the altar of the Lord, that they might bee unlike the Gentiles. The

Priests were forbidden to make their heads bald, or shave off the corner of their beard for the same cause. The ancients for the like reason rejected many customes of Ethnicks, Jewes, and hereticks, but were not constant in this course. As for the sun, the moon, the stars, and other creatures, howbeit they have been abused, and adored, yet because they are Gods creatures, and of necessarie use, they are still to bee used. Gold, silver, temples are profitable helps unto the necessitie of mans life. The gold, the brasse, and iron of Iericho taken into the Lords treasurie, were the civill goods of idolaters, and had no state in their idolatrous worship, as this kneeling hath. Wee should shun conformitie with papists in speciall, because the pope their head is the great Antichrist: and we are more troubled with rites, abused and polluted by him, then by any other: We dwell nearer to papists then to any other idolaters, & they dwell or converse among us. The equitie of this direction for not conforming with idolaters, appeareth, first, in that wee shew not as we ought our hatred and detestation of idolatrie, when wee retain any monument or memoriall of it. The brasen serpent it self a monument of Gods mercie, and benefite received 700 year before, was broken by Ezekias in pieces when it began to be abused and polluted with idolatrie: far more ought the monument and memoriall of idols or idolatrie be abolished.

It is

It is true, kneeling of it self is not a humane invention, but in some kind ~~may~~ may be lawfully used, as in prayer: but kneeling in the act of receiving the sacramentall elements was never Gods ordinance, and therefore ought to bee forborn, seeing in that act it hath beene abused to the vilest idolatrie that ever was, to the worshipping a piece bread, which the worshipper esteemed to bee his god. To retain it therefore is to retain a memoriall or monument of that vile idolatrie, because wee use that same gesture in that same very act, and without necessitie. Next, in conforming with idolaters, we keep a stumbling block in the kirk, and both hardeneth the idolater in his idolatrie, and lay a stumbling block both before our self, & our own brethren, by retaining such allurements and provocations, to commit the same kinde of fornication or idolatrie. *Wo bee to him that giveth offence, it were better that a millstone, &c.* They ask what aptnesse there is in this gesture, to inrise us to idolatrie? We answer, it is the same form and fashion that idolaters used in that same very act, and for reverence as they did. Wee are more prone to idolatrie by nature then any other sin: therefore the greater diligence is to be used in avoiding of it. Doolefull experience hath taught us how dangerous it is. The kirks in the Low-countries in their synods ordained, that the communion be not celebrated

brated kneeling, for the danger of bread-worship. The Polonian synods, holden anno 1573. and 1583. were grossly mistaken, in alleadging that none but Arrians or Anabaptists did sit: when as it is well known that this gesture of sitting was in use in sundrie kirks in Europe, of which wee have made mention before: yea, and Alasco before these times wrote more earnestly for sitting then any man else. But these Polonian synods were mixed, and consisted partly of Lutherians, partly of such as adhered to the Bohemian, partly of such as adhered to the Helvetian confession: Yet they confesse, anno 1578. that it is neither the will of God, nor the custome of the purer kirk to smite men with Ecclesiasticall discipline, for externall rites. Our opposits pretend the remedie of preaching, and information of the people, to direct their adoration aright. But it is better to fill up the pit in the way, then to set one beside, to warn the passengers that they fall not in. Watchmen are sometime negligent, sometime blinde and ignorant, or corrupt and perverse: time should bee better spent, then in leading poore soules through dangerous wayes, which may bee forsaken. All are not alike capable of information: appearance of evill worketh more powerfully oft-times then the doctrine.

They alleadge that the command of the Magistrate, in things indifferent, taketh away the scandal

dall. I answere, Can the supreme magistrate take away that aptnesse and fitnessse that any thing hath, to intise and provoke men to sin. The magistrates countenance maketh the scandall the greater, and hee strengthneth it by authoritie. Court-clawbacks tell us, we should rather offend the people then the supreme magistrate: but better offend, that is, displease him, nor offend, that is, give occasion to the poorest soul, let be many thousands to fall into any sin, let bee so hainous a sin, as is the sin of idolatrie. The magistrate is not in danger of stumbling, or spirituall falling into any sin: for (yee put the case) hee esteemeth the matter indifferent. The Apostle had rather never eat flesh, nor offend a weak brother, for eating flesh offered to the idole, and sold in the mercat. And yet hee had greater authoritie in such matters, then any prince, or generall assemblie. The Belgick synods would not take so much upon them, but forbade kneeling, for fear of idolatrie. If the kirk to whom the rule for directing the use of things indifferent, in matters of religion, are laid down, to wit, that all things be done decently, in order, to edification, without offence, may not presume so far, far lesse the magistrate.

Wee maintain that kneeling in the act of receiving the sacramentall elements was not in use, or at the least authorized, till the great antiehrift dominated. There can not be an authentick testimo-

nie alleadged before the opinion of real presence
 & transubstantiation began to spread: or to come
 to a more certain date, for the space of a thousand
 years after Christ. There are some testimonies
 bearing the word *adore*, but the testimonies are ei-
 ther counterfeited, or to bee understood of inward
 adoration, or of adoration in time of prayer, be-
 fore they communicate: Or adoration is taken
 only for veneration: but of kneeling in the act
 of receiving we hear of no authentick testimony
 as yet alleadged. Doctour Burges is verie confi-
 dent, that the communicantes kneeled in Tertulli-
 ans time, that is, about 200. year after Christ: for
 sayeth he, *herbe people shunned to come to the communions
 table on the station dayes, because they might not kneel
 in the act of receiving, but it behooved them to stand on
 these dayes: and therefore, sayeth he, Tertullian in-
 viteth them to come, to take the bread standing
 at the table publictly, to reserve it, and carrie it
 home, and there receive it kneeling, and so both
 dueties should bee performed; the receiving of
 the Eucharist, and the tradition on these dayes
 observed. Tertullians testimonie is cited out of
 his book, de oratione, cap. 14. But the Doctour
 translated these words, Quod statio solvenda sit
 accepto corpore Domini, Because station or standing is
 then to be performed in receiving the bodie of the Lord!
 whereas hee should translate thus, because the
 station or fast is then to bee broken, after the recea-
 ving of the bodie of the Lord.*

For

For the word *statio* in Tertullians language is taken for fasting, or rather for some kinde of fasting dayes. Wednesday and Friday were called station dayes, on which they fasted untill the third houre after-noon, and was distinguished from the other fasting dayes, whereon they fasted of their own accord, as Pamelius observeth out of Rabanus Maurus; or rather as a late popish writer Albaspinus, bishop of Orleans, in his observations observeth, were distinguished from other fast dayes, which indured till the evening. The meaning of Tertullian is this, they were in an error who thought that if they had receaved the Sacrament, their feast should bee broken, which should have continued to the set houre: Nay, saith Tertullian, *Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, sub ad aram Dei steteris?* Shall not thy fast or station bee the more sollemne, if thou stand also at the altar of God, that is, the communion table, for so both are safe, both the participation of the sacrifice, and performance of thy service, that is, of the fast, sayeth Plessie in his answer to the Theologues of Bourdeaux: and in his answer to the bishop of Evereux, pag. 225. hee sayeth, that Tertullian would remove that scruple, that as soone as ever they had communicated, they thought their fast was broken. Albaspinus seemeth to come yet nearer to the sence, and sayeth, Tertullian would reprove these that would break the station or fast, as soone as ever they had receaved the Eucharist,

and

and not stay any longer in the kirk, howbeit the time was short, and some few prayers were ordered after the deliverie of the Eucharist, for they communicated about the ninth houre of the day, which was the third houre after noon, about the end of the fast on these station dayes: for on other fasting dayes which indured to the evening, they receaved not the Eucharist. As for standing at the communion table upon these station dayes, it was not because they stood only upon these dayes, when they receaved the Eucharist. *Non accepta Eucharistia, non licebat ex eorum insigniis, & ex veteri disciplina de geniculis orare.* sayeth Albalpinaus, that is, It was not leasome by the ordinances, and old discipline of these times to pray upon their knees, when they receaved the Eucharist. Further he proveth, that upon these station dayes they stood not alwayes, but kneeled at their prayers: for the whole time was a time of mourning & afflicting of their bodies, but in these times it was a signe of joy, not to adore upon their knees. *Et at antiquas, & nascentis Ecclesie Christianos quodam in unis, & quoddam genus gaudens geniculis non adorare,* see pag. 52, and 49. The ancients in these times thought kneeling not futable with such an action as the participation of the Lords supper, because it was an action of joy and delights.

Yee see then howbeit they kneeled otherwayes upon the station dayes, because of their fasting and mourning, yet at the end a little before their dissolving

dissolving they stood at the common table. Now the reason why these dayes were called station dayes, was not according to his observation so called, because of the gesture of standing, but only by way of allusion to militarie stations, and watches at the gates of Princes palaces, that as they staid in their watch, whether sitting or standing, so the Christians staid in the kirk mourning, and praying, in these times of persecution, for peace and safetie to the kirk, till the third houre after-noon, at which time they communicate. It was the custome of the kirk, for a thousand year to stand upon the Lords day, and yet the Lords day was not one of their station dayes, which should have beene, if the gesture of standing only should make a station day, as Doctor Burges would have it. It is grosse ignorance in the Doctor, to affirm that the station dayes were these dayes, wherein they stood in prayer, and at all the solemne worship of God, and to denie that they were set dayes of fasting. Further is nothing more evident, then that Tertullian in sundrie other passages speaketh of stations, or station dayes, as dayes of fasting. Whereas in the Re-examination it was given, and not granted, that they stood on these dayes, in time of divine service or prayer, now being induced by the observation of Albaspinæus, Wee denie that they stood in time of prayer upon these dayes,

dayes, and therefore the argument is the more forcible for us; that notwithstanding of their humiliation, and kneeling upon these dayes of mourning and fasting, yet at the end, when they were neare dissolving, and ending their fast or itation, they stood at the table of the Lord, and received the Sacrament standing. Howbeit this was not the right gesture, yet it is clear they kneeled not when they received the Sacrament. Tertullian maketh no mention of receiving the Sacrament in their houses kneeling. For a thousand years they stood even in time of prayer upon the Lords day, and therefore it can not bee imagined that they kneeled, when they received the Sacrament.

But say our opposits, they used the same gesture in the receaving the Eucharist, which they thought fittest for prayer. I answer, they thought nor standing the fittest gesture for prayer, but kneeling, and stood upon the Lords day, to signifie their joy for Christs resurrection, which was a conceat taken up by them, not known to the apostle: for they kneeled not for the like reason betwixt Easter and Pentecost, and yet wee see in the 20. of the Acts, the Apostle Paul kneeled. The custome yet observed to this day in the orientall kirks, to communicate standing, notwithstanding that other custome hath ceased, declareth, that they intended never genieulation in the act of receiving. If ever kneeling in the act of receiving had been in use among them, it had not beene leit

off, considering mans pronnesse to idolatrie and superstition. It resteth then, that kneeling is only found in the kirks which were subject to the pope.

Howbeit this idolatrous gesture prevailed under the reigne of the great Antichrist, yet there wanteth not faithful witnesses to stand out against it, as the Waldenses, and the Picardi. If at any time wee should not seeme to have communion with Antichrist, we should most of all at this holy supper, which setteth foorth our communion with Christ and his kirk.

Yee see then, suppose that kneeling in the act of receiving were indifferent, yet in respect of the scandall, the danger, and inconvenients fall upon it, we ought to oppose it. But we are now to prove, that it is not indifferent, but idolatrous, and therefore a hainous sin, whether we consider it as it is enjoined by the act of the pretended assembly at Perth, or as the action may bee considered simple in it self.

97 Wee are directed by the act of Perth to kneel, in reverence of the Sacrament, which is idolatrie: for we are directed to kneel, in due regard of so divine a mysterie, to wit, as is the Sacrament, or as is the receiving of the body and bloud of Christ, to wit, in the sacramentall manner. Yee may also take up the intent of the act, by the intent of the English prelates, and their adherents, for conformitie with them is intended. Doctour Mortoun sayeth, that their kirk thought it fit, by outward reverence in

in the manner of receiving the Eucharist, to testify their due estimation of such holy rites. Master Hutton sayeth, they kneeled, to put a difference between the ordinarie bread and wine, and the sacramentall, to which they gave the more reverence, because it is more than ordinarie bread and wine. Some of the formalists pretend, that they kneel because of the prayer uttered at the deliverie of the elements: but that short bit of prayer, or wish, is ended before the minister offer the bread to the communicante, and bidde him take it, and yet the communicant is enjoined to continue still upon his knees. Nor is kneeling enjoined to them by statute, or their service book, in regard of prayer, but in regard of the Sacrament it self.

Master Paybodie pag. 334. doth freely confesse, that their prayer is not the principall respect of their kneeling, nor the principall respect upon which their kirk enjoined it: And pag. 299. suppose their bee no prayer used in time of receaving, hee thinketh never the worse of the gesture of kneeling. Doctour Mortoun, and Master Hutton, as yee have heard, professe they kneel, to testify their due estimation of such holy rites, and more reverence to the elements then ordinarie bread and wine. Now to testify more reverence to the elements by kneeling, is to testify by adoration, which is idolatrie. Neither are wee directed by the act of Perth, to pray in the act of receaving, but to use that kinde of gesture in the act of

receaving, which becometh meditation, & lifting up of the heart, which also may bee done without prayer. But prayer can not consist with the act of taking, eating, and drinking. Wheresoever the publick intent of a kirk is to kneel, for reverence of the Sacrament, every communicant following her direction, is an idolater *interpretative*, and so to bee construed both before God and man, whatsoever bee his own private intent. If any man receive the Sacrament upon his knees at Rome, or any other popish kirk, whatsoever bee his private intent, hee must bee interpreted to kneel, according to the intent of that kirk.

But setting aside the act of the assemblie at Perth, which is only a null and pretended assemblie, we shall consider the action it self, wee will prove that it can not be done but for reverence of the Sacrament, or sacramentall elements.

The first reason shall bee this, The communicant is tied, whether by direction of others, or his own resolution, all is one, to kneel with reverence before dead and senselesse elements, when they are presented to him by the hand of the Minister. Wee can not kneel to God in prayer, but there are many things before us by casuall position, neither can wee choose to do otherwise. But if wee bee tied to kneel with reverence, when wee are to doe any religious exercise, suppose prayer, before such a creature, suppose but a tree, and is not likewise tyed when wee pray before
any

any other creature, our gesture of adoration can not bee without respect to the tree. God himselfe never appointed any creature to bee an object to the eyes of man, when hee was to adore him upon his knees, but only directed his people to kneel toward a certaine place, where hee was present himselfe, in an extraordinarie manner, or bound himselfe by promise to heare from thence, as was the Arke, and Temple, where the Arke was. The Sacramentall bread is not a place of Gods extraordinare presence, or of the existing of Christs manhood substantiallie, or of promise to heare us from thence. *It is idolatrie, sayeth Perkinse, to turne, dispose, or direct the worship of God, or any other part thereof to any particular place, or creature, without the appointment of God, and more specially to direct our adoration to the bread, or the place where the bread is.*

The uncovering of our heads is a gesture of reverence onely, and that only amongst some nations, but not of adoration. Kneeling is a gesture of adoration, either civill or religious, amongst all nations. I will not kneele civilly to everie one, to whom I uncover my head civilly. Every one that standeth with his head uncovered, in presence of the king, is not adoring, as he is who is presenting his petition to the king upon his knee in their sight. Further our heads are no otherwise uncovered in the act of receaving, then in the rest of the time of the celebration, when wee are not neare the elements,
The

The Scripture is read, the words of Christ which he uttered at the institution are still and often repeated, his actions which are divine and holy are reiterated; and sometimes we are singing psalmes. But adoration upon our knees can not consist with such varietie of actions.

The people 1 *King*. 18. fell on their faces, after the fire had consumed the burnt sacrifices, and the wood, and licked up the water, and not in the mean time: for it is not likely that they fell down, till they had seene what the fire had wrought. What suppose they had fallen down in the meantime, that they saw the fire fall down upon the sacrifice? Is it any wonder, that men amazed with Gods majestie in a miracle, fell down as astonished, to worship God? Charles the fift after his farewell to the wars, saluted the Spanish shore in such an affectionat and prostrat manner, as his meanest vassall could not ordinarily have saluted either him or it, without just imputation of grosse idolatrie. ^{Sayth} Doctour Jackson. ~~signeth~~ If there come into the kirk one that believeth not, and one that is unlearned, and hear one after another prophesie, and finding himself convinced, and the secrets of his heart made manifest, were it any wonder, if he fell down on his knees, &c. 1 *Cor*. 14. yet if he fell down before them ordinarily, were it not idolatrous?

When it is said, 1 *King*. 8. 54. that Salomon kneeled before the altar of the Lord, when hee prayed at the dedication of the temple. The altar

is not set down there as the object, toward which hee directed his countenance, when he was kneeling, but only as a circumstance of the place where hee was, when he prayed at that time. Hee kneeled upon the brazen scaffold, which was over against the altar, and spread his hands towards the heavens, not towards the altar. And suchlike, 2 *Chron.* 6. 13. it is said, That he fell down upon his knees, before all the congregation of Israel, that is, in their sight and presence, and spread forth his hands towards heaven: It is not said, that hee turned his face towards the altar. They turned their face ordinarily to that part where the Ark was, the place of Gods extraordinarie presence, which therefore in Scripture is called sometime God, sometime the Lord of hostes, the king of glory, the face of the Lord. Doctor Burges, pag. 7. sayeth, that the altar was not alreadie dedicated, but was in the doing. Likewise *Micha* 6. 6. when it is said, *Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow my self before the high God?* meaneth, that they bowed themselves before the high God, sitting between the Cherubins, not towards the Altar.

When they had offered their oblations, what if they had bowed towards the place where the Ark was, when they were offering to God? when wee are in the act of receiving eating and drinking, wee are receiving, and not offering.

They pretend the sacramentall elements are only as *objectum à quo significative*, that is, an active object

ject moving them to worship the thing signified or God. Put case that were true, it will not helpe them. Durandus, Holcot, and Picus Mirandula, and other papists professe, that they adored the prototype or samplar before the image, which put them in minde of the samplar, and spake in as abstract a manner of their worship, as the formalist doeth, when hee pretendeth the purest intent hee can, in the manner of his adoration. And yet were accounted by other papists good catholicks. Vasquez proveth, that these Doctours made the image *obiectum quod*, the verie object passive of adoration, and that both the samplar and the image were adored together: For they used the same respect to the images, that other catholicks used, they uncovered their head to them, they bowed towards them, kneeled before them, and kissed them. And this hee defendeth to bee the right manner, when the image and samplar are adored with one adoration, the inward motion, and submission of minde being carried to the samplar, and outward signe of submission to the image, being transmitted by the spirit, or in thought and desire to the samplar.

This Iesuit reporteth, that in the time of the seventh synod, their were some enemies to images, who were content that images were brought into the kirk, not only for decorement, but also to stirre up the remembrance of the samplar, that before them they might reverence only the samplar,

plar, but exhibite no signe of honour or submission before the image, for that (they said) was idolatrie: and therefore they would neither kisse them, nor bow before them; but standing upright before them, being stirred up to the remembrance of the samplar, they were carried only in their minde to it. These were called *semiprobi*, as wee would say *mangrels*. Yee see then that taking the image only as *objectum à quo significative*, as instruments and meanes to stir up their remembrance, these mangrals would not kneel before them: for then, sayeth Vasquez, they should have adored them, which hee in his popish judgement thinketh they should have done. So if the elements be used only as *objectum à quo significative*, to stirre up their reverence, why kneele they before them. Nay, why are not the elements lifted up, as among the papists, after they have said, *This is my bodie*, (for, say they, it is made then a sacrament) that the people being stirred up at the elevation, with the sight of the signifying object, may kneel in whatsoever part of the kirk it bee.

If our formalists used the Sacramentall elements, only as an active object to stir them up, they would not kneele before them in the meane time, more then when they are stirred up by the word, or works of God, by a toad, an asse, or a flie.

But

But say they, there is a great difference betwixt images, which are the inventions of men, and the work of God, or the Sacrament. But wee say, In the case of adoration there is no difference. If the historicall use of images bee lawfull, as some of them do now maintain, what doth the presence of the image hinder to fall down and worship, if their reason be good. And if the use of images to this end bee forbidden, so are also the creatures. Wee esteeme indeed more of the works of God, then of the work-man-ship of man. Wee owe more reverence at the hearing of the word, decent and comely usage in the participation of the Sacrament, which wee owe not to images. Gods word and works are ordained by God for our instruction, and so are not images: But God never ordained them to this end, that in them, by them, or before them wee should adore him, or any other thing, wee are put in remembrance of by them. The brazen serpent was set up upon a pole, that these who were stigned with the fire serpents, looking upon it, might bee cured. Yet sayeth the Iesuit Vasquez, God commanded them to look upon it, standing upright, without any adoration, or signe of submission. The people of God of old kneeled not before their sacraments nor heard the word read, or expounded kneeling. Gods works are the book of nature, to teach us many things concerning God: But we must not therefore fall down before the Sun, or Moone, before

fore every greene tree, an asse, a toad, when they work at the sight of them upon our mindes, and move us to consider Gods goodnesse, wisdome, and power. When I am beholding a tree, an asse, a toad, and considering in them the goodnesse, power, and wisdome of God, I am reading upon the book of nature, contemplating, and gathering profitable instructions. I can not still bee contemplating, and in the meane time adore, kneeling in prayer, or praise, for that were a confusion of holy exercises. Nor yet after my contemplation, and preparatorie work to worship is ended, must I tye or set my self before that asse, toad, or tree to kneel, for then I should kneel for a greater respect to that creature, then to any other beside for the time, before which I might have kneeled casually without respect, and so the moving object shall participate of the externall adoration, my kneeling being conveyed by it to God, to whom it is directed by my spirit or affection, as Vasquez hath desccribed the manner of adoration of images.

Where it is objected, that men bow before the chaire of estate, or the Princes seale, which are dead and senselesse creatures. I answere, Civill worship is conveyed immediatly to the person of the Prince, by bowing before such senselesse creatures, becaule men think it expedient to uphold the infirmitie of Princely majestie by such meanes. But God needeth none such, nor will have none.

Next

Next, There is civill ordinances of the estate for the one, but their wanteth divine ordinance for the other. Francis Whit in his reply to Fisher, pag. 228. sayeth, *Civill and religious worship are of diverse beginnings and formes, and every thing that is possible, lawfull, and commendable in the one, is not so in the other.* Augustine *de civitate Dei, lib. 10. cap. 4.* sayeth, *That great humilitie, or pestiferous flatterie, may bee the originall of many honours given to Princes, borrowed from the formes used in GODS worship.*

Our next reason, Considering the action in it selfe, without respect to the act of Perth, to prove it idolatrous, is this, To adore upon our knees, when wee are performing an outward action, which is not directed to GOD immediatly, and in that action are occupied about an externall object, is idolatrie, unlesse that whereabout the action is employed, bee worthie of divine honour. Our taking, eating, and drinking the bread and wine at the Lords table, is not an action directed to God immediatly, as prayer, and thanksgiving is, nor yet as Vasquez the Iesuit sayeth, is it an outward signe of adoration.

Wee blesse and sanctifie the meat upon the table for our commoun use, but then it is object passive, not of adoration, but of blessing and sanctification for our use. Next, Wee blesse sitting, or standing, but are not tied to kneeling: Yea, we read not in Scripture, that any blessed the meat
upon

upon the table kneeling. Christ himselfe blessed sitting.

But to come nearer to the purpose, It were strange to see, after the meat is blessed, ~~we~~ ~~for~~ every one who is present to sit down upon his knees, with his countenance fixed upon the bread upon the table, or in the hand of the Master of the familie or feast, and to take, eat, and drink. Nature and custome teacheth us, it were rather a mocking of God, then a reverent adoration of him. But you will say, The sacramentall elements are holie bread and wine, the other commoun and extraordinarie. There yee betray your selfe, yee kneele then in taking, and eating the sacramentall bread, because it is holie. Now to kneele in respect of the holinesse of bread, and wyne, is idolatrie. And the true cause of your religious respect, and bowing before it, is the holinesse of it. Wee are prone to conceit too highly of things set a part to holy uses, as if they were of greater worth then our selves; for whose use they were instituted.

The papist thinketh hee taketh and eateth the body of CHRIST, which by reason of the concomitance of the God-head hee adoreth. Neither would any reasonable man bee so absurd, as to take, eat, and drink, adoring; unlesse he beleeved, that which hee were taking, eating, and drinking, were worthie of divine honour.

It

It were absurd to kneel before an earthly king, and still to bee eating and drinking. But it may bee our kneelers bee grosse enough in the opinion of the reall presence, and wee heare too much of it.

They say, Wee may pray mentally in the act of receaving, eating, therefore wee may kneel or adore in the act of receiving, &c. I answered, first, Wee may not pray when wee are bound to another exercise. In the act of receaving, eating, and drinking, wee should attend upon the audible words, the visible signes, and rites, meditate upon the analogie betweene the outward signes and rites, and the things signified, take, eat, drink mentally, and spiritually by faith. Our desires in the meane time are not prayers: Prayer is more than desire, it is a manifesting of our desires to God. The soule may send forth short ejaculations, like darts, in every ordinance, and these ejaculations may bee incident to all our actions, even civill, let bee religious, even when wee are eating and drinking our ordinarie meat & drink. But a set and continued prayer can not consist with other actiops. In suddaine ejaculations no other gesture is required, then that wherein the motion of the Spirit of God shall finde them. If mentall prayer might bee permitted, it is secret before the Lord, and the signes of it before men should bee concealed. Thirdly, What necessitie is it to pray kneeling in this act, more then at other

other prayers at which yee doe kneel. It is clear then, yee kneel not in regard of that pretended prayer, but because yee are before such a creature. The like may bee said of thanksgiving. Ejaculations of thanks may agree with the proper exercise of the Soule, in the time of receaving, eating, and drinking, as it may also with our ordinarie eating, and drinking at our tables, but not a set thanksgiving, which should require the attention of all the powers of the soule, and can not bee done without diverting the Soule from the exercise proper for the time.

Prayer is a craving, our taking, eating, and drinking is not a craving, but a receaving. Thanksgiving is properly directed to God, so is not our act of taking, eating, and drinking. The Sacrament was called the Eucharist by the Ancients, not for the act of taking, eating, and drinking, but for the thanksgiving preceeding, which was but a part of the action. The showing foorth of the LORDS death, by the act of eating and drinking, is but only a representation. The showing foorth by word, is only a declaration or commemoration. Representation, or commemoration are to men, and not GOD, resemble preaching, and not prayer, or thanksgiving. The celebration of the action it self, is a profession of thankfulnesse before man for a great benefite, but not thanksgiving directed to God. God is honoured by preaching, prayer, singing, swearing,

ring, praising, and not by adoring only. To honour is more generall than to adore. It is yet objected, that in the act of receiving, wee receive an inestimable benefite. Ought not a subject to kneele, when hee receaveth a benefite from his Prince, to testifie his thankfulness? I answered, If wee were to receive a gift, suppose but a morsell of bread, out of Gods owne hand immediatly, we ought no doubt to adore upon our knees, but not, if by the hand of the creature. The person who receaveth the gift from the King, is supposed to receive it immediatly from the king: or suppose hee kneele receiving from his servant, mediaticivill worship is not a rule for religious adoration, which should bee directed to God immediatly.

Now wee receive the Sacrament out of the hand of the Minister, not out of Christs owne hand. Yea, the Apostles at the first supper adored not on their knees, when Christ himselfe ministred the Sacrament, howbeit upon occasion, and at other times they adored: Nor did they adore God the Father upon their knees, for the benefite they were receiving. The inward benefite Christs body and bloud, is not the outward object, is received by the soule, not by the body, by the godly only, not by all that receive the Sacrament, by faith imbracing Christ present by his Spirit in the soule. Now the act of faith, or believing, is not an act of adoration, nor is it expressed outwardly by kneeling. Wee receive, eat, and drink Christs
body

bodie and bloud, as soone as wee are effectually called, and begin to believe, and as oft as we believe the promises of the Gospel, when wee heare them read or expounded. CHRIST bodie is farre absent from us at the receaving of the Sacrament. We are united with Christ, and made members of his bodie, before wee come to the Sacrament, and doe not receive his bodie at everie communion, as if wee had lost it since the former: and yet there is but one bodie received at all the times. Wee are said then to take, eat, drinke Christs bodie and bloud at every celebration of the Lords supper, because wee put foorth our faith in act at that time; and renewing the act of faith, wee take, eat, and drink by believing, that same bodie and bloud, which wee did before, our faith being strengthened by the outward signes and seales to that end, and so grow by faith in union with Christ. Further, the manner or forme of receaving a gift, should bee answerable to the manner of the offering, the nature of the gift, and the will of the giver. If a King call his Nobles to a banquet, it is his will that they sit at table. Howsoever then otherwise, and at other occasions wee behave ourselves as supplicants, wee are now according to our Lords will and pleasure, to observe that externall forme of a feast, which hee hath left to his kirk, and to act thereat in our outward carri-

age the persons of gueſts, and friends, as hee calleth us, *Iohn 15. 15.* Therefore howbeit the inviter bee a great person, the manner of invitation is familiar, to assure us of our preferment, and fellowship with him, howbeit there bee great inequality betweene us and him. Againe, if wee should kneele, because wee are receaving a gift, by this reason wee should kneele, when wee receive any gift or benefite from GOD: As for example, When wee are eating and drinking our ordinarie meat and drink. If yee will say, the one is holy, the other commoun, then yee confesse yee kneele, because of the holinesse of it, and that is idolatrie. If yee will say, yee receive a greater gift, then when yee receive your ordinarie food, that is not more, but that then is a greater motive. Yet if it be called a gift, then whensoever, or whatsoever gift yee receive, yee ought to kneele. God deserveth thanks for the least of his benefits, because bestowed upon us by so great a Lord, and for his owne excellencie, which is the reason upon Gods part, that moveth us to adore him.

It is frivolous which is alleadged, that what we crave upon our knees, wee may receive upon our knees: For wee crave our dayly food, rayment, and other necessaries upon our knees, and yet wee receive them not, nor use them upon our knees. It is as frivolous, That what wee crave of GOD
upon

upon our knees in publick worship, wee may receive upon our knees. For wee may crave in the time of publick worship upon our knees, things necessarie for this temporall life, and so wee doe, when in the Lords prayer wee pray, *Give us this day our daily bread.* By this kinde of reasoning, what I crave in private worship upon my knees, I may receive upon my knees. But it is not the diversitie of the time and place where wee crave, or receive the benefite, more then the diversitie of the benefite it selfe, that is the ground of adoration, but Gods excellencie, as wee said before.

They consider not that these three things ought to bee distinguished, blessing, or sanctifying the creature, or meane GOD hath appointed, either for our temporall or spirituall life, before the use of it, the use it selfe, and thanksgiving after the use, the blessing before meat, the use of meat in receaving, eating, drinking, and thanksgiving after, blessing before the reading, preaching, or hearing of the word, the act it selfe, reading, hearing, preaching, and thanksgiving to GOD after, blessing before the receaving the sacramentall elements, the receiving and participation it selfe, and thanksgiving after.

They ask if humilitie and reverence bee not requisite in the act of receiving the sacramentall

mentall elements. I answered, Yes, in all religious exercises, hearing of the word, reading of the word, &c. But it followeth not, that there should bee humiliation upon our knees, because humilitie of minde is required: nor adoration, because reverence is required. Is there no reverence nor humilitie, but in kneeling before dead and senselesse elements? Humilitie is an habit, adoration is an act. The act of humilitie is immanent, whereby any one resteth content with his owne ranke, and doeth not conceit greater worth in himselfe then there is, specially in comparison with GOD. Adoration is a transient act, whereby a man goeth out of himselfe, as it were, to direct some homage, and worship to GOD. Reverence is commoun to all the parts of GODS worship, and is not a distinct kinde of worship, as is adoration. *The pretence of reverence can not bee a sufficient reason, for the altering the ordinance of Christ, and the opinion of reverence hath often bene the dame and nource of manifold superstitions,* sayeth Bishop Mortoun upon the Lords supper, pag. 63.

Seeing kneeling in the act of receiving the Sacramentall elements, eating, and drinking is idolatrie, and can not bee used but idolatrously, it followeth, that kneeling in the act of receaving brought not in artolatrie, or bread-worship, as some mistaking counterfoot works of old

of old writers for genuing have imagined. The
 corrupting of the doctrine, with the opinion
 of the reall presence, the receiving in at the
 mouth from the hands of the priest, and ma-
 ny other superstitious conceats, together
 with the worshipping of images,
 brought in kneeling. But it was
 ever idolatrous from the
 first beginning and birth
 of it, and can not
 possibly be pur-
 ged of ido-
 latrie.

FINIS.



OF FESTIVAL DAYES.



THE observation of festivall dayes hath been rejected by our kirk, from the beginning of their reformation, in the explication of the first head of the first book of discipline, in the assemblie holden anno 1566. where the latter confession of Helvetia was approved, but with speciall exception against these same dayes which are now urged. In the assembly holden anno 1575. the assembling of the people to preaching and prayers, upon festivall dayes was censured. An article was likewise formed to bee presented to the Regent, craving, that all dayes heretofore kepted holy in time of papistrie besides the Lords day, be abolished, and that a civill penaltie bee inflicted upon the observers.

By ordinance of the assembly, in Aprile 1577. Ministers were to bee admonished, not to preach or minister the communion at Easter or Christmas, or other like superstitious times, or readers to read, under the pain of deprivation. The pulpits have sounded from time to time, against all shew of observing these dayes. But at the pretended and null assembly, holden at Perth, a number not having power to vote, presumed to bring in a contrare practise.

Our first reason against these holy festivities, God hath only power to sanctifie a day, and make it holy, that is, to separate it from common use to holy exercises yearly. God hath given libertie to man to work sex dayes. No man ought to bee compelled to keepe them holy, but when GOD himself maketh exception, as he did by the yoke of some anniverfarie dayes by the law.

The second reason, None appointed holy festivities under the law, when the times were more ceremonious, but God himself. The dayes of Purim were called simply the dayes of Purim, not the holy dayes of Purim, or feast of Purim. No peculiar sacrifice was appointed, nor any holy convocation of the people enjoined. The ordinance required but fasting, joy, and sending of portions to other. The memoriall dayes of the dedication were called the dayes of dedication, not the feast of dedication. They were not holy dayes, or festivall solemnities, consisting of Hookers three elements, praises set foorth with chearfull alacritie of minde, delight expressed by charitable largeness, more then common bountie; and sequestration from ordinarie works. The times were corrupt, when these dayes were appointed. As for Christs conference in the porch of the temple, in the dayes of dedication, it proveth not that hee honoured that feast, as they call it, with his presence, only the circumstance of time is pointed at, when Christ had this conference.

rence. Christ come up to the feast of the tabernacles before, and stayed in Ierusalem. In the meantime the dayes of dedication fell foorth, and hee went away immediatly after his conference.

The third reason, Neither Christ nor his apostles appointed festivall dayes to bee observed by Christians, but rather inhibited the observation of them, and changed only the old sabbath into the first day of the week. The anniversarie solemnities were not changed, but altogether abrogated. The apostle having occasion to teach upon this subject, condemneth observation of dayes ceremoniall, or of ceremoniall nature. They were a rudimentarie instruction of old, which beseemeth not the state of a Christian kirk, and cleare light of the Gospel. Yea, the very dayes of Purim, and the dayes of dedication were of a ceremoniall nature, saith Doctour Mortoun in his defence, pg. 64. To celebrate the memorie of a particular act of Christ, at a set time in the year, with cessation from work, sermons, gospels, epistles, collects, and hymnes belonging therto, with joy and gladnesse, without admitting a fast at any time, is not to observe a day morallie, but ceremoniallie. If there had beene other festivall dayes, which might have beene observed by Christians, the Apostle having so fair occasion, when he was treating of the observation of dayes, hee would not have spoken so generally, but directed Christians to the observing of these. If other dayes had bene dedicat

dedicat to Christ then the Lords day, they should all have beene called the Lords dayes, but the scripture maketh mention of one day, called the Lords day. Socrates in his historie sayeth, Hee is of the opinion, that as many other things crept in of custome in fundrie places, so did the feast of Easter prevaile among all people of a certain privat custome and observation. If the Apostles had appointed it, they had agreed upon the day, seing they were directed infalliblie by the Spirit.

Our fourth reason, If it had beene the will of God, that the severall acts of Christ should have bene celebrated with severall solemnities, the holy Ghost would have made known the day of his nativitie, circumcision, presenting to the temple, baptism, transfiguration, and the like. But it is confessed, that the day of Christs nativitie, and consequently of the rest depending thereupon, are hid from mortall men. And this is sufficient to declare the will of God concerning other notable acts, which were known, that not the act or action upō such day maketh a day holy, but divine institution. No man denieth but the nativitie of Christ should be remembred, and so it is, whersoever the gospel is preached. But we deny that the memorie of it must be celebrated with the solēnntie of a festivall day, with cessation from work, feasting or forbearance of fasting, and a proper service.

Our fift reason, Suppose observing of holy dayes had been at the first a matter indifferent, yet seing they

they have beene abused, and polluted with superstition, they ought to be abolished. And therefore Zanchius approveth them who have abolished all other dayes, but the Lords day. Sure it is, that in former times holie dayes have beene abused, not only with licentious ravelling and surfitting, but also with the opinion of worship and merit, and a Iudaicall conceit, that the devil is not so bold to tempt men on these dayes, as at other times. Suppose observation were free of these abuses, yet it may degener after the same manner, as before: but the observation is not, nor can not be free of abuse and superstition. They say, they esteeme them not holier then other dayes, but only keepe them for order and policie, that the people may be assembled to religious exercises, and instructed in the mysteries of religion. But both are false. The papist confesse themselves, that one day is not holier then an other, in the own nature, no not the Lords day, but in respect of the use and end: And so doe our formalists esteeme our festivall dayes holier then other dayes, and call them holy daies. And as for worship, If the observing of a day holie, for the honouring of a Saint, be a worshipping of the Saint, the observing of a day to the honour of Christ cannot bee without opinion of worship. They are called mysticall dayes, and appointed for the solemnitie of some mysterie of religion, and are ordered according to the known and supposed times, when such things fell foorth, to
wit,

wit, Christs nativitie, passion, ascension, &c. If only for order or policie, wherefore is there but one day betweene the passion and the resurrection, fourtie dayes betweene the resurrection and ascension, and then again, but ten betwixt the ascension and whitsonday. May not, and are not Christians instructed in the mysteries of religion, without the solemnities of dayes, and appropriation of service to them, after the Jewish maner? Do wee not appropriate to the day of Christs nativitie a peculiar kinde of service, of epistles, gospels, collects, hymnes, homilies, belonging to Christs nativitie, and think it absurd to performe the like service upon any other day, with cessation from work. To observe dayes after this maner, is not like the appointing of houts for preaching, or prayers on week daies, or times for celebrating the communion, according to the policie set down by everie particular congregation. Wee use time then only as a circumstance, and for order, and do not appropriate these divine exercises to these times. Howbeit Christ rose upon the Lords day, yet was it not appointed to be observed after the Jewish manner of observation of their festivals, for then every Lords day, the matter of sermons, collects, hymnes, gospels, &c. should have beene only Christs resurrection. But yee see the use and end is morall and generall, for the instruction of the people of God in all mysteries of religion.

A passage of Master William Corvper
pretended bishop of Gallovay,
his sermon delivered before the
Estates, anno 1606. at which
time hee was Minister
at Perth.

On 2 Corinth. 6. 3. 4.

Sto the giving of offences, our Savi-
our hath forewarned us, that there
will bee offences, but he hath pronoun-
ced a fearfull wo upon them by whom offences
come, It were better, sayeth our Saviour,
that a milestone were put about his neck
and hee cast in the midst of the sea. And
by the law of Moses hee was accursed, that
laid a stumbling block before the blinde. The
equitie of that law yet remaineth under the
gospel, binding the Christian, that no man put
an occasion to fall, or a stumbling block before
his brethren, but most of all a Christian preach-
er, his office is to edifie others in the most holy
faith, and to strengthen the brethren, hee be-
ing converted himself. It should therefore
be far from him, to give any that are weak an
occasion to stumble and fall: generally hee
may do it by his evill life, for hardly can
weak ones believe that the religion is good,
where

where the life is evill: yea, by it they take occasion to blaspheme the truth of God, and to speake evil of his name. A preacher is compared by our Saviour to a candle, to shine to others; and againe, to the salt of the earth, that should season others. A candle once lighted, if it dieth out, smelleth worse then if it had never beene lighted, and salt that is made by concoction of salt matters, if againe it returne into water, becometh more unisavourie, and unpleasant to the taste then any other water: so, a preacher once separate by God, chosen out from the world, & entered into a holy calling, if againe he return to be a worldling, if in his life he become profane, and suffer the light that is in him become darknesse, falling away from his first love, of all the men in the world hee becometh the greatest offence, and the latter end of that man shall bee worse then his beginning. These are the words I spake the last time, wherewith yee were offended, and now I repeat them, that others may see no cause of offence is in them. More specially a preacher giveth offence, by doing any of these two things: First, when a preacher of greater gifts and knowledge, becometh
 soever

ſoeuer hee do it of a good intention, draweth
 on a weaker brother to follow him in a cauſe
 wherein hee hath not a warrant from God.
 A notable example whereof we haue 2 King.
 13. where a prophet of Iuda being ſent to Be-
 thel, to denounce the judgements of God a-
 gainſt Ieroboam, for his idolatrie, was com-
 manded neither to eat nor drink in Bethel.
 Ieroboam could not beguile him, for hee gave
 the king this anſwere, If thou would give
 me the half of thy houſe, I wold not goin
 with thee, nor eat bread; nor drink water
 in this place, for ſo I was charged by the
 word of the Lord. But an old prophet decei-
 ued him, ſaying, I am alſo a prophet as well
 as thou art, and an angel of God com-
 manded me to bring thee into my houſe,
 and cauſe thee eat bread. Thus the autho-
 ritie, the age, the pretended light of an other
 prophet draweth either prophets in an euill
 courſe, whereunto otherwiſe they would not
 bee eaſily induced. Heereby wee that are of
 meane gifts in the miniſtrie are admoniſhed,
 neuer to depart from that immediat warrant
 of doing in our calling: we haue of the word of
 God, for any mediat warrant brought out of
 th

the promptuarie of mans wit, suppose it were covered with never so fair pretences: yea suppose an angel would come from heaven, and bring an other doctrinethen that which is delivered us in the word, wee are not to credite him, far lesse an earthly man that speaketh, but contrariwise to hold him accursed.

The other thing wherein the preacher may give offence, is, if hee alter or change in any point of his calling, either in doctrine or discipline, departing from that which once hee maintained. This rule is given us by the apostle, Gal. 2.18. If I build again these things I have destroyed, I make my self a transgressor. This is a rule by which ye can not refuse to be tried, and which necessarily binds you^t to stand to that truth of doctrine and discipline yee have once embraced, unlesse yee would be found trespassers, and such as give just cause of offence that our ministrie should bee reprehended. If ye have any new light ye had not before, communicat to other brethren, that we also may follow you. If not, I beseech you walk not in that course, wherein the light of GOD doth not allow you.